



*Library of*  
**ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY**



BRIGHTON, MASSACHUSETTS

# The Review

Founded, Edited, and Published by Arthur Preuss.

Published Weekly at \$2. a Year (Foreign \$2.50.)

Office: 13 N. 3rd Street. Telephone, Bridge 246A.

[Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as Second Class Matter in August 1896.]

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page	Page	Page	
Historical Criticism and the Catholic Mind. [R. S.]	Catholic Editor. [Rev. J. F. Meifuss.]	279	<b>Current Educational Topics :</b>
273	Late Controversies and their Bearing. (Joseph Otten.)	282	An Important Decision of the Propaganda.
<b>Subjects of the Day :</b>	<b>With Our Exchanges.</b> (Arthur Preuss —Rev. J. F. Meifuss.)	284	<b>Book Reviews and Literary Notes :</b> Literary Notes.—Booklist.
More Minimalism. (Rev. J. F. Meifuss)—Church and State in South America. (F. L. Jade.)—A Heroic			Notes and Remarks.
			288

## Historical Criticism and the Catholic Mind.

**W**E read in the Gospel of St. Matthew (ii, 25 sq.) that when near the dawn of day Christ walked upon the waters and approached the boat in which His disciples were struggling against wind and waves, far from recognizing His gracious presence, they were troubled, saying: "It is an apparition," and they cried out for fear.

Have not similar incidents occurred during the many centuries in which the bark of Peter has been tossed about by the persecutions and the insidious attacks of infidelity and heresy? "Because of their long experience of anti-Christ they will be troubled at every novelty of trial, they [the good Christians] shall have fear even at the approach of the Lord, suspecting deceitful appearances" [St. Hilary.] Good, pious men, anxious to preserve the purity of faith, and suspicious of all novelties, have sometimes denounced as dangerous, nay as impious, what was not only harmless, but proved to be a help sent by God for the protection of His Church. In the dim light of

dawn, their eyes could not clearly distinguish objects at a distance and their excited imagination made frightful visions and spectres of what they would have found most friendly to them if they had seen it near. St. Bernard, the devoted son of Mary, severely blamed the Canons of Lyons for introducing the "novel, unheard-of feast of the Immaculate Conception;" and yet we all know how much this feast and this devotion have done to strengthen and spread the veneration of the Mother of God. When Ignatius of Loyola by his 'Spiritual Exercises,' began to lead people to the service of their God and Creator, he was denounced to the Inquisition and cast into prison as one suspected of heresy; and yet he and his sons, animated by the spirit drawn from these 'Exercises,' have done more to check heresy than perhaps any other body of men. In modern times, when infidel scientists are attacking the Church with their impudent hypotheses, some Catholics begin to suspect every scientific movement, however legitimate,

which does not run exactly in the old beaten tracks. They apprehend dangers from all science. They see ghosts everywhere. And this we have witnessed recently in the case of Father Grisar's lecture on Historical Criticism. \*)

## I.

Father Grisar, knowing the mental attitude of many Catholics, had anticipated their verdict on his statements :

This work (Catholic historical criticism) may not always meet with becoming recognition ; there may arise at times the objections of foolish, excessive zeal, which will brand the negative results of criticism as crimes against the sanctuary. But this is to be accepted calmly. Science must expose itself to the storms of life, and not yield before opposition, like a nervous woman.

Foolish zeal is to be found everywhere. After THE REVIEW had published the lecture, a "Catholic Family Journal," the Louisville *Record* (May 30th), came out with the statement that Father Grisar's view "may trench on dangerous grounds." What, indeed, may not become dangerous? Certainly lack of criticism is more dangerous than criticism itself, as we may see from the disastrous follies into which it has led mankind. We need but recall the lamentable aberration of the human mind manifested in the trials for witchcraft.

The article in question does not give any reasons that prove the existence of danger here, but exhausts itself in mere generalities. Consequently a refutation is not called for. But as similar apprehensions may exist in the minds of other people, it will be useful to show what the attitude of the Catholic mind ought to be towards criticism.

It has been said †) that "to the calm Catholic mind, well grounded in the faith, and ever conscious of the supernatural side of the Church, Father Grisar's lecture will make an adverse, painful impression. .... The learned Professor's views are too *wissenschaftlich*."

There is more than one absurdity in this short passage. We had believed that the

Catholic scientists who took part in the Congress at Munich—men distinguished for loyalty to the Church, as well as for learning,—who heartily approved of Father Grisar's views, might have a claim to the title of "calm Catholic minds." What, then, is the "calm Catholic mind"? A calm mind, we think, is one that carefully examines a question under discussion, quietly weighs the reasons advanced *pro et contra*, and then judges without passion, disturbance, or prejudice. In order to judge calmly in matters concerning both science and religion, one must above all possess a clear knowledge of what belongs to his faith, what is essential and what is accidental, and especially what is the exact relation between reason and faith.

The Vatican Council lays down the following fundamental principles :

Although faith is a source of knowledge superior to reason, the two can not be opposed to each other, or arrive at contradictory conclusions ; for both come from God who can not contradict himself. An apparent contradiction arises from the fact that either the dogmas of faith have not been understood and expounded according to the mind of the Church, or mere speculations of reason are given out as indubious conclusions. Hence assertions and conclusions opposed to *illuminated faith (illuminatae fidei)* are altogether false (Sess. III, cap. 4.)

According to the Council, therefore, errors may be made in two ways : First, by proclaiming as certain results of science what is merely a conjecture, a speculation, a hypothesis—this indeed is a very common mistake among modern scientists.—Secondly, by pronouncing as a doctrine of the Church what the Church has not declared as such, also by interpreting matters pertaining to religion in a sense more rigorous than the Church does, by treating things that are not essential, as though they were. If the first error is disastrous, the second is by no means harmless. Errors of this kind may happen at all times ; they happened ages ago, and, owing to lack of criticism, many were not detected for centuries. If a Catholic historian, in his researches, discovers such an error, if, let us say, he finds trustworthy documents proving

\*) Published in THE REVIEW, May 23rd.  
†) Ibidem.

that some pious tradition has grown up on a false historical basis, what is he to do? Is he to shrink from the evidence? Is he to say *a priori*: "this document must be false?" Why should he? Of course, from the very outset, there ought to be an inclination to stand for the tradition, but if the proofs against it are really convincing, he need not and can not defend it further.\*)

## II.

Suppose, for instance, a historian finds good documents showing that some time in the 13th century a noble Italian family *De Angelis* had stones transported from Nazareth, out of which they built the Holy House of Loreto, and he can trace the gradual development of this fact into the pious legend that *angels* have transferred the Holy House of Nazareth. What doctrine of the Church is endangered by this discovery? None whatever. And although the peculiar attraction to this shrine exists no longer, yet not even the devotion to the Holy House of Loreto need be given up, as it is in no way implied that the Blessed Mother of God has not chosen this place to bestow special graces on her devout children. As regards the feast of the *Translatio Domus Lauretanae* there is no reason why it might not be celebrated in future, just as an *Anniversarium Dedicationis Ecclesiae*; in fact the mass of that feast has the character of a feast of the dedication of a church (see *Kirchenlexikon*, vol. VIII., 150). In a way, it might be called the translation of the Holy House of Nazareth; of its having been transferred by angels, not a word is said in the prayers of the mass; and if the Breviary does say it, we know that this is not an infallible source of

historical knowledge. We know that many changes and corrections have been made and others are likely to be made. Let it be remembered that Pope Julius II. in a Bull, in the year 1507, speaks of the tradition as: "ut pie creditur et fama est."

Let us take another instance. Suppose a historian finds documentary evidence that the tradition about the institution of the rosary is historically untenable; that beads were used in some form long before St. Dominic, and that the present form of the rosary is not to be found until long after this Saint. (See the controversy on this point in the English *Month*, 1900 and 1901, 'Popular Devotions,' by Father Thurston.)

It was long ago admitted that there were serious doubts about this tradition. Even Dominican writers, as Father Loë, although defending the tradition, ascribe to it no more than "the very greatest probability." What should be at stake if the tradition were proved to be unhistorical? Certainly no dogma, nor the devotion itself. Many a Catholic may say his beads fervently without the slightest knowledge of the tradition; why should our love for this excellent devotion grow cold, if it should be proved that it was not given to St. Dominic by the Blessed Virgin? The usefulness and excellency of the devotion does not rest on this fact, but on its intrinsic worth and on the approbation of the Church. The very writer who has attacked the tradition most vigorously, Father Thurston, concludes his criticisms with the following words:

Whatever may be the history of its origin and first development, the rosary, for the learned and unlearned alike, is not only one of the simplest of prayers, but also, as I sincerely believe, one of the most helpful means by which the soul may learn to live continually in the thought and presence of the Son of God made man.

Such discoveries may, at first, surprise the pious Catholic; but if he is really enlightened and possessed of a "calm mind," they will not make an "adverse and painful impression" on him. He is aware of the possibility of such mistakes in traditions, and if the error is proved he will calmly, though perhaps reluctantly, submit. He knows that such traditions

\*) When, in the following pages, we frequently speak of traditions, it is evident that we do not mean tradition, in the restricted or theological sense in which, together with Scripture, it is the source of our faith. We speak of them exactly in the sense Father Grisar has taken them, "unwarranted traditions, accounts of miracles and fabulous narratives, some graceful and poetic, others crude and extravagant, which through lack of knowledge and of critical judgment, have settled in layers around the lives and miracles of God's Saints, their reliques, and the venerable shrines of Christendom." Unfortunately non-Catholics often mistake these legends for the apostolical and ecclesiastical tradition and ridicule Catholics for believing such "traditions" to be part of divine revelation. Cardinal Newman has well said: "Half the controversies which go on in the world arise from ignorance of the facts of the case; half the prejudices against Catholicity lie in the misinformation of the prejudiced parties." (*Idea of a University*, p. 378.) Even some Catholics seem not always to distinguish clearly between the two kinds of tradition.

however beautiful and edifying, are not essentials of his religion, no more than the ivy on the wall of a church is an essential part of the building.

He knows that in the field of the Church there grows not only the genuine wheat sown by God himself, but also the cockle, sown by the enemy, and many an empty ear of wheat which sprang forth from good seed degenerated in the course of growth. The Church herself, from time to time, had to forbid certain forms of devotion, certain religious pictures and other articles; bishops had repeatedly to warn their flocks against credulity with regard to miracles and apparitions. The Church reserves judgment in these matters to herself, but how does she ascertain the facts, on which she bases her judgment? On the very historical criticism of which some Catholics seem to be so much afraid. We mention only the most painstaking historical investigations in examining the heroism of virtue and the miracles of those that are to be raised to the honor of the altar.

### III.

Would it not be better to conceal such discoveries, lest the faithful be scandalized and the adversaries of our faith find an opportunity of attacking our principles and practices?

This suggestion, though not openly enunciated, seems to be at the bottom of many objections to historical criticism.

We answer: Such proceeding would be altogether dishonest, and the end never justifies the means. If such principles had been followed, works like Pastor's 'History of the Popes' and many a chapter of Janssen's 'History of the German People' and of other splendid Catholic productions would never have appeared. Have these works done any harm to the cause of Catholicity? We think the very contrary. The principle of concealing historical facts which every Catholic deplores is not shared by our present Pontiff, who laid down as the rule for Catholic historians Cicero's famous words: "The first law of history is never to dare to utter a falsehood, and never to fear to speak the truth." The

eternal truth has pronounced solemnly: "Veritas liberabit vos" (John 8, 32). "The concealing or hushing up of truth can be followed by very evil consequences," says Father Duhr, S. J., in a recent work on trials for witchcraft. True, the Catholic must "ever be conscious of the supernatural side of the Church," but is it lawful, for this reason, to overlook its natural side? To forget that it is a congregation not of angels, but of weak and sinful men, and that even its divinely appointed head is infallible only within a very limited sphere, viz., in ex-cathedra decisions concerning faith and morals.

Further let it be understood that the principle of concealment rests on a false supposition, namely that the faithful are scandalized and the opponents of the Church are given weapons to attack her.

We dare assert that those timid souls that dread dangers to their faith from every discovery of science, are not at all "well grounded in their faith," nor "conscious of the supernatural side of the Church." No, to them apply the words of Christ spoken to his trembling Apostles in the storm at sea: "Why are you fearful, O ye of little faith?" (Matth. 8, 36). They forget, that in the storms that rage around the bark of St. Peter, Christ is ever present. They forget that all scientific discoveries either will prove true, and then they must infallibly turn out to be harmless to religion, or may even aid in the confirmation of revelation; or the dreaded visions are phantoms, mere opinions, conjectural hypotheses destined to pass away like thousands of others before them. In most cases the Catholic need not attempt any refutation; for no sooner does one such "discovery" arise and startle the world, than it is followed and overthrown by another, "later" discovery. To each of them we may apply the words of St. Peter to Saphira, which a German philosopher used with reference to modern philosophical systems: "Behold the feet of them who have buried thy husband are at the door, and they shall carry thee out" (Acts. 5, 9). Thus in either case, whether the discovery is true or false, the Catholic who is firm in his belief,

knows that the cause of truth is safe. From this it need not be concluded that we should look with indifference on the wild speculations and arrogant assertions of infidelity; far from it. Wherever they appear, let us promptly point them out, denounce them, refute them, hold them up to the ridicule they deserve. But we should never be afraid of them. Infidel science has become a bugbear to the mind of too many earnest believers.

Catholics and Christians generally are much too cowardly, we think, in the presence of the so-called scientific world and give far more weight to its view of things than is at all deserved. Scientific men exhibit a confidence, peremptoriness, sometimes superciliousness, which gives an impression of their having far more of argument at their back than really exists. (Dr. Ward, 'Philosophy of Theism,' vol. II, ch. 14.)

But this does not warrant us to denounce all speculative and experimental science. Dr. Ward says immediately after the above quotation:

We should run counter, indeed, to the Church's whole teaching, if we sought to repel them by denying either the truth or the value of experimental science; but we ought most carefully to distinguish between the *genuine* principles of such science, and others which so many of its votaries most gratuitously assume.

What we have particularly to beware of, is not to see dangers for religion, a probable death-blow to our Christian faith, in scientific theories and problems which have no connection with it at all.

#### IV.

Let us take an instance from another field of knowledge on which the "struggle between faith and science" is especially fierce—the natural sciences.

Not long ago the present writer heard a well instructed Catholic warmly attack the theory of evolution, on the plea that, if it were admitted, we had to give up our proof for the existence of God. What is the real state of the case? If we except the origin of man—the immediate creation of body and soul is clearly expressed in Scripture—"there is no reason on

the part of faith which prevents us from admitting the origin of the present species of plants and animals from a few original types, and in *this* theory of evolution is nothing which is contradicted by the sources of faith" (Father Knabenbauer, S. J.) The Catholic scientists that reject this theory, as well as many non-Catholics and agnostics, do so for merely scientific reasons, because no proof has been given for the theory, because, as a German non-Catholic biologist says, "it is only a new chapter in the 'History of Human Follies'; a sham-theory which proves how easily the world may be led by the nose."

And this is true of other sciences. The Catholic may complain of rash assertions, hasty generalisations, unwarranted conclusions, but he will not desire to check real science in its course. Whenever a conclusion is drawn contrary to his faith, he rejects it calmly, knowing that "human sciences are not to be treated with such freedom that their assertions, if at variance with *revealed* doctrine, can be received as true" (Vatic. Counc., sess. III, ch. 4.) Then he says: "*Scio cui credidi.*" If at variance with a *tradition*, although a pious one, the attitude of the Catholic mind must be different; calmly waiting for the outcome of the discussion. There is, consequently, no reason for scandal to the faithful, and no reason for "branding the negative results of criticism as crimes against the sanctuary." Those who act in this manner, are themselves to be blamed for rashness. "They have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge" (Rom. 10, 2.)

Should we conceal such discoveries in order not to furnish our adversaries weapons of offence, we should be lamentably mistaken. The very opposite of what we intended would take place. Their historical researches would, sooner or later, discover what we tried to hush up; then they would have an opportunity of mocking at our beliefs and practices, of discrediting the Church and the attitude of the Catholic mind; they would suspect our truthfulness; they would be led to apprehend that even many of our doctrines rest on no better foundation than the traditions which they may have proved to be groundless.

## V.

This leads us to another important consideration. Father Grisar's views,—and honest historical criticism in general seems to be involved in the charge—are said to make an “adverse, painful impression” on the Catholic mind. Perhaps on some simple souls. But if there is danger of offending the ignorant, there is also danger of shaking the faith of the learned and preventing earnest seekers after truth from embracing the faith. This danger exists when we denounce as irreligious what they perhaps know to be a fact, or when we stubbornly maintain as truths, what they perhaps have proved to be mere legends. Father Grisar says: “Frequently educated laymen have come to me, in whose hearts these foolish traditions had excited violent temptations against the faith. A proof that they had not a clear knowledge of the situation.” These men have precious souls as well as the humble and illiterate. All endeavors should be made to save them by removing the obstacles, not indeed by any compromise of Catholic doctrine; not by “passing over certain heads of doctrine, as if of lesser moment; nor by softening them so that they may not have the same meaning which the Church has invariably held”—this system of winning non-Catholics has been condemned by Leo XIII. in his Apostolical letter “*Testem benevolentiae.*” The deposit of faith must ever remain intact; but it is necessary to put forth clearly what belongs to it, what is Catholic doctrine and what is merely a pious belief.

The Santa Casa di Loreto and the “*Sed piuum est credere,*” says the *Record*, save multitudes of precious souls, while science with its concomitants like “Historical Criticism” does not; it indeed, if anything, plunges many into eternal perdition.

Against this statement a serious objection must be raised: no true science, worthy of that name, plunges anyone into perdition, but the abuse of science, or pseudo-science. On the contrary, all true science leads to God and its services to the cause of religion are summed up in the well-known formula: “Reason is the handmaid of Faith.” The Vatican Council says: “Not only can reason

and faith not contradict each other, but they combine for mutual aid and support; reason assists faith by demonstrating the foundations of faith.” That this service of reason is more needed at present, is undeniable, and it is bad policy to disparage reason and science. Therefore if Father Grisar's views are really “*wissenschaftlich*,” really scientific, they need not be suspected of being dangerous. \*)

## VI.

One more remark in conclusion. The *Record* says that “the Holy Spirit ‘breathes where he will,’ and the humble, illiterate washer-woman may know more of Him and His eternal truths by infused (sic!) knowledge than the most profound theologian by his acquired knowledge.” No good Catholic will ever despise the simple piety of such a person; still, are we perhaps to consider the “illiterate washer-woman” as the type of the “calm Catholic mind”? Father Grisar did not speak to such persons; he expressly recommended “caution, forbearance, and gradual progress. At first one should address limited circles and then let the truth spread little by little beyond.” The readers of THE REVIEW are mostly priests and educated laymen; such persons it is desirable to address. They are able to understand and appreciate the Professor's views and have ample opportunity and in many cases the duty of acquainting the people with them, gradually and discreetly.†) If other papers, read by another class of people, had published the lecture, they would have been guilty of indiscretion, as it is certainly not opportune to carry the discussion immediately before those who are not yet prepared to hear it and for whom it was not intended.

For this reason THE REVIEW believes it did well in presenting the lecture of P. Grisar to its readers.

R. S.

\*) We must protest against the abuse of the words “Wissenschaft” and Science, as though they were synonymous with scepticism and infidelity. This abuse is an insult to one of God's noblest gifts and one of the Church's most beautiful ornaments.

†) See also THE REVIEW, May 9th, 1901: “Excrescences of an Unsound Piety.”

## Subjects of the Day.

Father Cuthbert, O. S. F.

**More Minimism.** C., in the *Tablet* of April 6th, writes upon non-Catholic witnesses to the faith,—meaning theological writers outside the Church. “We shall never face aright the problem of re-conversion of Protestants until we get rid of the notion that Protestantism is utterly evil and unspiritual. The schism of the sixteenth century was for the punishment and the ultimate purification of the Church. In presence of Protestantism the academic rationalism pervading the schools gave place to earnest purpose and solid argument. Now-a-days, theology has become stereotyped; a work, like ‘External Religion,’ by Father Tyrrell, S. J., is an exception to the general rule. It is otherwise outside the Church, where Catholic teaching is receiving such new and original treatment as it has not experienced since the golden period of Scholasticism. Freedom of thought fostered by Protestantism.... now bids fair to infuse new life into Catholic theology. The theologian of the future, looking upon the Reformation, may exclaim ‘O felix culpa!’ Caird and Harnack are men whose work is worthy of consideration.”

The résumé is taken from the June number of the *Dolphin*, literary supplement to the *American Ecclesiastical Review*. What is true in Fr. Cuthbert’s view, is not new. Already St. Augustine (*De vera rel.*, cap. 25) has said: “Si superbia non esset, non essent haeretici: hi autem si non essent, multo pigrius veritas quaereretur.” That we will readily grant in favor of Protestantism. On the other hand, what there is new in the article, is not true. No real theologian of the past, present, or future will call Protestantism a “felix culpa” and get enthusiastic over it, as the Church does over the sin of Adam, in view of the superabundant redemption. On the contrary, every real theologian will apply to Protestantism the words of St. Gregory the Great (*Ep. II. ad Gerunt.*): “Haereticorum ecclesiae synagogae magis diaboli appellandae sunt quam

Christi conciliabula.” Every heresy is a new rent in the seamless robe of the divine Master.

Professor Harnack is recommended as a leader in the historical method for elucidating dogma—Harnack who wrote: “When we are told, You are split up, you have as many doctrines as heads; we retort: That is so, and we do not wish it otherwise; we long for still greater liberty, more individuality in speech and doctrine (hence for still more doctrines than heads? For every head at least two or three opposite opinions?).... Such is the evangelical answer to the objection of being split up, and such is the language of liberty that has been given us.” (Harnack, ‘Das Wesen des Christenthums,’ page 172.)

He must be a pitiable theologian who seeks elucidation of Catholic dogma by the light of Harnack’s criticism.

\* \* \*

Another article, written in the same strain and for a similar purpose, appeared in the *Revue du Clergé Français*, of May 15th. It is the editor’s notice of the last article ever written for the *Revue* by Rev. P. Vacant, of Nancy, chief-editor of the ‘Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique.’ The *Dolphin* (June number) thinks it “contains much that is suggestive,” and gives this synopsis:

Theology must be at once scientific and progressive. It makes use of philosophy; and on some questions philosophy has not yet said, and will indeed never say, its last word. Leo XIII. has commanded the study of the philosophy of St. Thomas; but he never wished to impose the intolerable burden of receiving *en bloc* all the theses of the ‘Summa.’ We shall find a great deal to weigh in Leibnitz, Kant, Spencer, and Fouillé. We can rejoice to-day at the increased understanding of the idea of doctrinal development. It is not necessary that we should attempt to prove from Scripture and the Fathers theses not clearly expressed in the early centuries and formulated only in modern times. P. Vacant is quoted as having said: “The proofs from tradition are the least carefully done part of the theological manuals.”.... “I have

many times instructed my pupils to erase the *de fide's* and the *certum est's*, which have been multiplied without regard to the axiom *odia restringenda*." Often the teaching given out in the seminaries in such great abundance is promptly forgotten. It would perhaps be wiser to confine attention to the more important things and to do these carefully and scientifically — to treat, for instance, the Divinity of Christ, Development, Evolution, Socialism in the true scientific method and spirit; to demand weekly essays on these questions (in the vernacular), and to correct and return the work.

Verily, here is much "that is suggestive," but hardly in a good sense, except for the advocates of "Minimism," "Liberalism," "Americanism." — J. F. MEIFUSS.



#### Church and State in South America.

Our occasional correspondent in Chili, Signor Federico Luis

Jade, writes to us from Tarapaca under date of June 1st:

A cause for public uneasiness is the serious sickness of President Errazuriz (he has since died. — EDITOR.)

Federico Errazuriz is about 50 years old, and of very feeble health; his term will end on the 18th of September; his administration was surely an able one, although in no wise of extraordinary merit; he proved to be a skillful politician and a cool head; his loss will be sincerely felt by all parties.

The two candidates who are actually bidding for the national vote, Pedro Montt and German Riesgo, both belong to the Liberal party; but the former is known to be moderate and of conservative tendencies, whilst the latter is decidedly favored by the Radicals. The Conservative party has thrown in its lot with Montt; so have several fractions of the Liberal party; yet there is a considerable number of Conservatives who openly profess allegiance to Riesgo, while a few Radicals are Monttinos.

German Riesgo is not slow to assure the Church and the Conservatives of his friendly disposition towards them; yet it is rightly insisted that his administration would actually

mean enmity to the Church and still more aggressiveness in foreign affairs. His election would surely be a calamity for the country.

The name of Pedro Montt, on the other hand, stands for a friendly coöperation of Church and State and fair dealing with the neighboring republics. So far both seem to have equal chances; the government is making a unique and praiseworthy effort to assure the non-intervention of its officials; President Errazuriz, to whom Riesgo is a near relation, went even so far as to retire from office during the campaign, in order to avoid the appearance of favoring his relative; a few days afterwards he was stricken by paralysis.

The last session of Congress has given the country a law which obliges every citizen between 18 and 48 years to render military service for at last one year. The military spirit of the masses already too intense since the Pacific war (1879), is growing visibly under the new departure, which is due to the efforts of General Körner, a German, who is at the head of the army since many years. The tendency to militarize everything threatens to absorb many higher and more useful aspirations of the country.

Of course, every step that Chili does in this line, is necessarily considered a provocation by her neighbors. The Argentine Republic is arming fast and will try to introduce obligatory military service; Bolivia has applied to Germany for a dozen military instructors; Peru is making popular collections for battleships; you see, militarism, which has been considered a purely European aberration, is firmly establishing itself on this free continent.

I suppose your attention has been drawn to the drama "Electra" of Perez Galdós; it is being represented all over South America, with the unmistakable intention of raising popular feeling against the Church and the monks. A few weeks before its production in any place, the local Masonic press begins to agitate and prepare the public for outrages. So far only at Lima and Rio Janeiro have there occurred insignificant disturbances. In the Argentine Republic and Chili "Electra" has

been severely condemned by public opinion as a very poor and insipid product of hatred and despair; in most places it appeared only once on the stage; on several occasions the public gave vent to profound disgust and the actors were afraid to stay to the end.

Slowly but surely grows the work of regeneration initiated by the Latin-American Council, as the authorities enforce its decrees. Before long we will have uniformity in rites and discipline, which had both suffered during the last century. The solidarity of all under a common authority appeals strongly to the clergy and will no doubt also extend to the laity as the Spanish edition of the 'Acta Concilii' becomes more widely circulated. It may be hoped that the present indifference towards the Church among the higher classes of South America will give way to a thorough revival of Catholic faith and practice.

On the other hand it seems quite natural that the numerous enemies of the Church rally their forces and rush their activity.



#### A Heroic Catholic Editor.

Julian San Martin, the heroic editor of *El Industrial*, of Quito, Ecuador, died April 17th, 1900, at his home in Quito, and by the kindness of Alfaro, the radical President of Ecuador, THE REVIEW has been favored, after a lapse of more than a year, with No. 303 of the *Industrial*, published by friends of San Martin, and containing a sketch of his life, his edifying death and imposing funeral.

Julian San Martin, whose parents are still living, was born in 1843 in Nabon, Ecuador. Until his first communion he studied and worked alternately. At the age of thirteen, in order to assist his parents, he left Ecuador, seeking work in Peru. Forced to leave Lima on account of a fever, he returned to Ecuador. Up to that time his work seems to have been coating looking-glasses. For more than two years San Martin now found employment in a commercial house in Guayaquil. Thence he returned to Lima, where for the first time he sought to make himself useful by writing for

some Catholic publications. But the air of Lima did not agree with his religious feelings. He moved to the Catholic city of Arequipa. There he began a hardware store and grocery and, at the age of thirty, married the faithful companion who through so many years of trial was his brave support. His business at Arequipa prospered; he enjoyed the highest esteem of his neighbors and the citizens in general. Then came the unwarranted attack by a Freemason mob on the Jesuit college. Julian San Martin was at the head of the distinguished group of citizens that protested against the outrage and himself wrote a public protest which was circulated through the whole country. The government was furious and offered a reward of \$2,000 for information about the author of that circular. Don Julian had to leave the country. He went back to Ecuador. His financial losses were great, yet undaunted, he started in Quito a weekly, *El Atesano*, (The Workingman.) Not understood by his fellow-laborers, after two years he changed that paper into *El Industrial*, by which he won his greatest victories and fame. A staunch defender of liberty, a firm and practical Catholic, he soon came in collision with the ruling powers. Twice his printing office was ransacked and ruined; four times he was imprisoned; several years he was in hiding, but continued to issue his paper under great difficulties. He was a mainstay of the St. Vincent de Paul conference, founder of the workingmen's club, and member of the Immaculate Conception sodality for men.

When his oldest son had made his profession in the Franciscan order, San Martin started the *Revista de San Antonio*, a paper serving exclusively the edification of the pious.

Towards the middle of April, last year, Don Julian was attacked by influenza. He felt his end approaching and piously received the holy sacraments on Good Friday. Tuesday after Easter the end came. Surrounded by friends and several clergymen, whilst the prayers for the dying were recited, he calmly gave up his soul into the hands of his Maker.

But the dead body of the humble workman and persecuted journalist was not left to his

afflicted widow and orphaned children. The Catholic society of Quito claimed it as its own. A noble lady, the Señora Da Carmen Larrea de Orejuela, had it brought to her mansion and placed in state in her parlor. In the evening of the 18th of April the corpse was transferred to the church of San Francisco. The whole city turned out to view it and pay its respects to the dead hero. The next morning, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Quito, the funeral service began with the singing of the office for the dead. The church was crowded to suffocation. The most distinguished members of the regular and secular clergy, lawyers, physicians, students, and

workingmen were present. For many years Quito had not seen so imposing a funeral.

When the solemn rites were over in the church, the body was carried away on the shoulders of Catholic men, who vied with one another for the honor. The magnificent hearse remained empty. Thus the mortal remains of Julian San Martin arrived at the cemetery of San Diego, where before interment two addresses were made by prominent laymen.

The champion of the faith, the model Catholic layman, the intrepid editor had well deserved this triumph after death. R. I. P.—J. F. MEIFUSS.

## CHURCH MUSIC.

### *Late Controversies and their Bearing.*

In 1868 a papal commission of five experts was appointed to prepare for publication what was known as the *Editio Medicæa* of the Gregorian Chant. This edition was originally published, in 1614-15, by order of Paul V., and was the result of labors extending, with short interruptions, over a period of forty years. It constituted a revised version of the chant then in use, and was undertaken, at the command of Gregory XIII., by Palestrina.

The commission of 1868 had strict instructions from the Congregation of Rites according to which its labors were to be confined to externals, such as the grouping of notes, the manner of notation, etc., so that the essential character of the chant remained as they found it. When the commission had completed its task, the Sacred Congregation and Leo XIII. gave it their sanction, and hence it became known as the official version of the Gregorian Chant. The publication of this version was offered to Catholic publishers in various parts of the world indiscriminately, but Pustet & Co. of Ratisbon were the only firm to undertake the task, none other being willing to assume the financial risk involved.

There were, of course, at that time, many

different versions of the chant in use which enjoyed episcopal approbation. Notable among these was the Solesmes version, edited by Dom Pothier, O. S. B., for which it was, and is still, claimed that it constitutes the traditional melodies as penned by St. Gregory.

While strongly recommending the official version to the Catholic world, and urging the bishops to introduce it in their dioceses, the Pope, nevertheless, permitted the use of other versions, notably Dom Pothier's, for the time being. This was not satisfactory to the good fathers of Solesmes, Beuron, etc. They were disappointed at being placed in the position of having their time-honored version only tolerated. Simultaneously with the discontent of the Benedictine Fathers, there arose a general storm of indignation in France against the Holy See and the Congregation of Rites for imposing on the French episcopate what these malcontents were pleased to term the Ratisbon edition. Some papers forgot themselves to the point of accusing the Holy Father of being in league with Bismarck in order to humiliate the French. The Pope never formally commanded the adoption of the official book, but improved every opportunity of appealing to the bishops and the religious congregations, stating on several occasions that he took it for

granted that for faithful Catholics the wish of the Supreme Pontiff was synonymous with his command. Repeatedly did the Congregation of Rites state that it was contrary to the facts and repugnant to its wishes to designate the official books as the "Ratisbon Edition," setting forth that the firm of Pustet & Co. was simply the printer and the agent of the Sacred Congregation in this matter. It has all been of no avail. The agitation and misrepresentation has never ceased.

On the first of January last the thirty years' copyright held by Pustet & Co. expired. While Msgr. Carlo Respighi created a stir in 1899 with his pamphlet concerning Palestrina's participation in the Medicean edition, the war broke out all along the line in December last, and has continued since, letters from Rome appearing in German, English, and French papers. It was stated plainly that the Holy Father was about to make an end of the restrictions put upon church musicians in regard to the use of unauthorized editions, that full freedom was to be restored to all in matters Gregorian. Nothing was left unsaid in these numerous communications which might belittle the official version and its editors. Their authors were not at all particular in their statements. The wish was frequently father to the thought. It was plainly intended to create the impression that general dissatisfaction existed concerning these books, not only in France, but particularly in Germany, and that the Solesmes version was gaining in favor. Thus we read in a Roman letter to the London *Tablet*, in its issue of June first, that the plenary council of South American bishops, held in Rome in June 1899, adopted the Solesmes edition for all the churches under its jurisdiction. The fact is that, in articles 445 and 446 of the acts of this council, the use of any but the official version is positively forbidden. It is also authoritatively denied that the Solesmes version has been introduced in the South American College in Rome, as stated in the same letter to the *Tablet*.

Consistent with its principles and its purpose, the St. Cecilia Society has been the un-

wavering advocate and propagator of the official books. It has been the bulwark against the attacks on the part of the so-called friends of liberty in Gregorian matters. Appreciating and being in obedient sympathy with the wishes of the Holy See to bring about uniformity in all matters pertaining to the cult—in the sacred texts, the ceremonies, and the music—its president, Dr. Haberl (who was also a member of the papal commission which prepared the official version) and its members have been a constant obstacle in the way of a more successful propaganda on the part of the friends of Solesmes. Hence it became expedient to weaken and minimize the prestige of the society in the eyes of the bishops and the public, and, as far as possible, to deprive of their binding force the numerous decrees of the Congregation of Rites concerning church music, which are the basis of authority for the society. This in the opinion of many prominent church musicians, both lay and clerical (among them the celebrated Fr. Utto Kornmüller, O. S. B.,) is the object of the much-discussed book of P. Ambrose Kienle, O. S. B., which has inspired this article.\*)

Seldom has a book, written by a religious and approved by a number of bishops aroused such universal disapproval. Expressions of regret at its publication are general. It is pointed out that the author employs his erudition and dialectic skill in destroying that which has been built up with infinite pains and sacrifice during more than thirty years, and that its spirit will tend to encourage sloth and indifference on the part of church musicians.

Fr. Kienle's book is particularly directed against a work by Rev. Paul Krutcheck, entitled 'Music According to the Will of the Church.' This work is considered by Fr. Kienle to embody the tendency of the more austere among the Cecilians. In reality Fr. Krutcheck is not any more austere than any of his colleagues, but is simply consistent in the application of principles laid down by the

\*.) 'Mass und Milde in Kirchenmusikalischen Dingen.' By Fr. Ambrose Kienle, O. S. B.—B. Herder. Price \$1.00.

rightful authority. He has, moreover, successfully refuted Fr. Kienle in a pamphlet called 'Rechtes Mass und Rechte Milde,' using as a most effective weapon Fr. Kienle's own 'Little Manual for Church Music,' published in 1893, and paralleling contradictory passages in Kienle's two books. While it is acknowledged that 'Mass und Milde' contains a great deal of useful and wholesome matter, it is agreed on all sides that its tendency on the whole is destructive and even pernicious.

An amusing feature of this controversy has been the very active interest which the press in this country, where the Gregorian Chant is generally tabooed, has taken in what is called the restoration of the Gregorian Chant in its primitive purity. People who do not know one note from another have written long articles about a question which has engaged the attention of such savants as Gevaert, Hondard, Lans, Deschevrens, S. J., Gietmann, S. J.—all of whom are opposed, on scientific grounds,

to the claim of the Benedictines that they are in possession of the traditional, St. Gregory's own, version.

In the mean time, the much-heralded letter from the Holy Father to the Benedictines of Solesmes has been made public. Undoubtedly it is somewhat different from what some people wished it to be. It praises them for their zeal in their studies and archeological researches, and accords them full freedom in their labors as long as the law of charity and the respect and obedience due the Holy See are not ignored.

Although anyone may now print and publish the official books, Pustet's copyright having expired, no one may change a single note in the musical text. The wish of the Pope for uniformity in the use of the chant is still in force, the decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites are still valid, and conformity with them, whenever possible, is still incumbent upon all Catholics.—JOSEPH OTTEN.

## WITH OUR EXCHANGES.

The Bachelor of Arts who with so much spirit and decency edits the Spokane *Catholic Herald* and lately drew a shaft from our bow on account of the ingratitude wherewith he requited our good services, which he had himself solicited, \*) now prints the following (July 6th):

Arthur Preuss, editor of the St. Louis REVIEW, and self-constituted Catholic dictator of the United States, again sees fit to poke fun at the obnoxious *Herald* in his issue of June 27th, classifying it amongst those papers "that are unfortunately classed as Catholic without having any right to the title." In like spirit and with a like show of reason, we might accuse Mr. Preuss of being a Mohammedan, as well as of evincing a decided leaning towards cannibalism.

Mr. Preuss is the possessor of a very fair stock of cheek, as well as a memory dutifully oblivious of all things past. Comparing what has been and what is, he must have been bathed pretty thoroughly in the Styx, heel and all, and emerged a new man, a Catholic of the Catholics. Never was

transfiguration so complete. We do not mean to accuse Mr. Preuss of insincerity in his present views. On the contrary, his sincerity is painful in its intensity. Even Archbishop Ireland himself is not spicy enough for his ultra-Catholic palate. So likewise do several of the leading Catholic papers of the country sin by their tepidity. We mention no names, but those interested enough to follow us will know to whom we refer.

One little piece of advice we would most humbly offer the great Mr. Preuss, namely, that he might do well to cultivate a little of that "broad sympathy" he is so desirous of seeing evinced on the part of others.

Meanwhile, Mr. Preuss or no Mr. Preuss, title or no title, the *Herald* will run as it has been run, and only hopes to continue to merit in the future as it has in the past the support and approval of those who are better qualified than Mr. Preuss to judge what a Catholic paper ought to be. To our minds, the humble editor, striving to reach the homes and hearts of the people, and guide them through the many pitfalls of everyday life, is of more real utility than the mighty journalistic acrobat, striving after effect

\*) See No. 15, p. 232 of THE REVIEW.

and seeking only to tickle the palate of such among his readers as may be more than ordinarily conversant with the devious mazes of theology.

Before us lies a circular sent out broadcast the other week from the office of the *Catholic Herald*, 610-612 Sprague Ave., Spokane, Washington, and presumably composed by the same gentleman who penned the above quoted paragraphs, since he signs in every issue as "Managing Editor."

From a comparison of the statements made in this circular, sent out to catch subscribers, with the editorial remarks of Mr. Francis H. Butler, A. B., it appears that that estimable goodman is indeed distinguished by the broadest kind of sympathy, but, alack and alas! also by a woful want of consistency and of that sound Catholic spirit which never, not even in business circulars when trying to scoop in shining dollars, deviates one iota from the rules of faith and moral practice.

In his editorial reprinted above Mr. Butler poses as the humble editor who, in contradistinction to the mighty journalistic acrobat moving about in the mazes of theology, furnishes the masses of the people with a good, plain home paper. In his circular, page 2, he declares that he "aspire(s) to a higher end than the mere dissemination of current news topics;" which higher end he farther down describes as "of a nobler and more literary character." He wants to aid those who are "anxious to investigate more or less deeply the moral problems underlying the great issues of the day," though without the use of "high-sounding or dubious scholastic terms."

So much for Mr. Butler's consistency. Now for his "broad sympathy."

The circular says :

We do not....intend that our circulation be confined entirely to our Catholic fellow citizens. We hope to interest our Protestant neighbors as well, and to this end shall studiously exclude all violent religious discussions from our columns.

And addressing himself directly to his Protestant neighbors, he writes :

We only ask them to be patient and follow closely such articles—Theological, Philosophical and Historical—as will from time

to time appear on our pages. Of the result we are confident. Broadmindedness and tolerance for the opinions of others are, and have been, the characteristics of the Protestant Church (*sic!*), and if our articles are but read in this spirit, we have no doubt that our readers will disabuse themselves of many of, what we will be excused for styling, their absurd impressions in our regard.

Towards the close of this remarkable circular its real purpose is overtly given out :

With the hearty coöperation which we are experiencing from Catholics and Protestants alike, and the keen interest taken by all in the success of our efforts, we hope to add many more to the ranks of our subscribers in the near future. No mere difference of religious opinion should hinder you from joining those who have already subscribed.

What theological, philosophical, and historical articles of value the *Herald* has so far printed, were scissored from **THE REVIEW**, the *Freeman's Journal*, or some other Catholic paper. When the editor recently applied to us for a list of good Protestant journals to exchange with, can it be that he intended to clip from them as liberally and perhaps devote six of his twelve pages weekly to Baptist or Mormon stuff in order to add as many "broadminded and tolerant" Protestants as possible to the ranks of his subscribers?

We are trying hard to cultivate broader sympathy; but not for the life of us can we feel even a particle thereof for the spirit or the methods of the *Catholic Herald*, which (in the circular referred to) rightly boasts of being "a distinct departure from the stereotyped lines of modern journalism." —ARTHUR PREUSS.



In the *Katholischer Westen* of July 4th and the *Catholic Tribune* of July 6th, the editor, Mr. Nicholas Gonner, makes a fresh plea for Catholic casinos or social clubs, which he considers valuable chiefly because they afford our young people an opportunity to meet socially and form acquaintances which lead to good Christian marriages, thus preventing mixed marriages, which are one of the main sources of our leakage. Mr. Gonner makes a recent

note in **THE REVIEW** on this subject, written by the undersigned, the ground of an ungentle attack.

Having quoted Mr. Gonner verbatim on page 371 of the last volume of this journal, we said :

We can readily understand that a priest may advise parents who have grown up children, to give them a proper opportunity to find a partner for life; but when a layman advises priests to arrange for what the late Father Hecker called "corporeal sacraments" (moonshine excursions, theatricals, card-parties, socials, etc.), we are of opinion that as long as we ordinary priests have not received an extra ordination to administer "corporeal sacraments," the old Roman advice is best for us: *Ne sutor ultra crepidam.* Imagine a St. Paul or a St. Peter arranging a euchre-party or a moonshine picnic!

The rest of our article is irrelevant to this discussion.

We have not denied the usefulness of casinos and properly conducted pastimes for Catholics exclusively; we simply took exception to the idea of Mr. Gonner, that priests should be the managers of such things, for the reason that they are not ordained for it, nor educated to it. The whole training of a priest is carried out on different lines than picnics, socials, card-parties, etc. We have not, as Mr. Gonner intimates, used the argument of "small minds" to escape embarrassment: "It is none of your business." We saw fit, though, to apply to ourselves the quoted proverb. If Mr. Gonner thinks it fits himself also, he may apply it. And if he is a gentleman he will retract what he said so urgently about the undersigned—J. F. MEIFUSS.

## Current Educational Topics.

**An Important Decision of the Propaganda.** Some three years ago the Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster was requested by a Catholic parent to forward an appeal, that he had drawn up, to the Holy See, for sanction or at least toleration of a proposal to send Catholic boys to one or other of the great English public schools. The appeal was in the form of doubts for solution, and was accompanied by a forcible exposition of the reasons that were thought to justify the proposal.

The following is the reply of the Holy See, dated Rome, January 31st, 1899, but only recently made public by the Cardinal (see *Tablet*, No. 3189):

Your Eminence has laid before this Sacred Congregation certain doubts to be solved as to whether Catholic boys in England may be allowed to frequent the public schools, in which youths are prepared for the higher courses of study given in the universities. This assuredly grave and delicate question has been most carefully examined by the Most Eminent Fathers of this Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide, and their judgment was that the frequentation of public schools of this kind can not be without a

grave danger to faith and morals, or be held consistent with the use of those means which the Church properly prescribes for the sanctification of souls; and that therefore an obligation is incumbent on Catholic parents not to expose their sons to this grave danger.

The analogy, which some think adducible, from the fact that the frequentation of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge has been tolerated, is invalid. For, in the first place, the danger for youths of still tender years can not be regarded as no greater than that, to which young men may be exposed, whose minds have been formed and who have fully imbibed the principles of their holy religion in the Catholic colleges. Then as there is no Catholic University of higher studies in England, circumstances seemed to require that measures should be adopted, in order to render remote the proximate danger to which Catholics might be exposed in the public universities. Well known measures for this purpose have been prescribed and acted on.

But as there are many flourishing Catholic colleges in England which give what is termed secondary education, no similar necessity exists for sending Catholic boys to be educated in the public schools of the country.

This was the judgment arrived at by the eminent Fathers in a general congregation, held on the 23rd of this January, and it was laid the day after, by the undersigned Archbishop of Larissa, Secretary of the same Sacred Congregation, before the Supreme Pontiff. His Holiness gave it his entire approval and desired it to be made

known to your Eminence by these letters, nothing doubting but that all Catholic parents in England will accept this decision as their rule, and will show to their sons the same love as that which Holy Mother Church bears to them as children begotten by her to Christ.

## Book Reviews and Literary Notes.

—It may interest the friends of Father Sheehan's 'My New Curate' to learn that the leading Catholic daily of the Fatherland, the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, is just now printing a German translation of the story in serial form.

—The charge is now made that Poe's "Raven" was taken almost bodily from "The Parrott," written by an Italian and published in Milan in 1809, the year of Poe's birth. Large extracts are given to substantiate the charge. We suspect with the *Freeman's Journal* (July 13th) that Signor Penzoni (the author of the charge) has been playing the same game that Father Prout played on Tom Moore when he translated some of the poet's verses into Latin and then wrote an essay on the "Rogueries of Tom Moore," in which he accused Moore with plagiarizing from the Latin.

—Our opinion of the alleged humor of such writers like George Peck is shared by Dr. De Menil, of our St. Louis literary quarterly, the *Hesperian*. In a note on the subject he says in his accustomed trenchant style (No. 7):

"Of course, people will laugh—even if they have to pay for it. Every paper, grave or gay, has its column of humor, manufactured, worked over or most frequently stolen bodily. There are many papers whose entire pages are devoted to the business of securing laughter. And it is but just to say our most successful ones, financially, are those whose tendencies are downward, whose moral tone is lower than low comedy. They have no reverence, and irreverence leads to infidelity. Their coarseness, vulgarity, the profanation

of sacred subjects, the certain but indirect ridicule of parental authority, the humorous parade of domestic infelicity, the recital of criminal news that calls for pity or tears, in a humorous, heartless manner, all this tends to lower public taste, purity of speech, and cleanliness of public morals. The tendency of the 'stories of 'bad boys' is vicious. Our criminal courts prove it. The most successful humorous paper on the continent is quite frequently but a step from obscenity. What we want is more elevation, more purity of tone. Humor that depends on smut is vile. Humor that causes laughter over unfortunates, as drunkards and criminals, is malevolent, heartless. Humor that struggles for a laugh at the expense of religion is satanic. But we need humorous papers; we want honest laughter, not that mixed with blushes, nor that causing irreverence, nor those papers which fill their columns with jibes and laughter that smell somewhat of crime and the slums; for an honest laugh is a pulse-beat to the Heart beyond the stars."



### A LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

[This list is published with the purpose of announcing important new publications of special interest to Catholic readers. B. Herder, 17 S. Broadway, St. Louis, Mo., supplies the list and has the books in stock.]

**The Catholic Girl in the World.** (Second Series.) By Whyte Avis. Net \$1.00.

**The Life of Mother Mary Baptist Russell.** Sister of Mercy. By her brother Rev. Matthew Russell, S. J. Net 75 cts.

**The Catholic Pulpit**; Educator and Expositor. Vol. I. Net \$1.60

**The Eve of the Reformation.** By Francis Aidan Gasquet, O. S. B. (New edition). Net \$2.75.

**The Holy Gospels.** With Notes by the V. Rev. Canon McIntyre. Net 40 cts

**Doris.** A Story of Lourdes. Net 75 cts.

**A Hidden Heroine.** By Stella Hope. Net 50 cts.

**Before Our Lord Came.** An Old Testament History for young children. By Lady Amabel Kerr. Net 40 cts.

# Lectoribus. . . . .

The editor and those associated with him in getting out THE REVIEW feel the need of a vacation; therefore the paper will not appear next week. No. 19 will be published on August 8th.

We wish Father Brockhagen's suggestion were carried out and a law made prohibiting the publication and reading of newspapers when the mercury rises above 95°.

## NOTES AND REMARKS.

Mr. W. H. Thorne appears to be gradually recovering his health, and we rejoice to see a better spirit in the current number [42] of the *Globe Review*, even though from the purely literary point of view it is inferior to its usual standard. Mr. Thorne is pleased to apply various uncomplimentary epithets to the editor and a contributor of THE REVIEW, because of our criticism of his publicly expressed and defended false views on marriage and the temporal power. He begs pardon for and indirectly retracts these views in the current issue and adds: "I have never wilfully contradicted or denied any Catholic dogma—I can not. *Credo*, and that settles it all."

With the aid of "a number of good and learned priests" Mr. Thorne hopes to succeed in guarding the *Globe's* "ancient orthodoxy" in future.

If he succeeds, as we sincerely trust and pray, the *Globe Review* will find THE REVIEW again as staunch a friend and ally as in the days before our late unpleasantness.

*Amicus Thorne, sed magis amica ecclesia!*

A writer in the *Pastoralblatt* (No. 6) points out some faults in the new *Catholic School Journal* and concludes, as our own critic did (No. 9 of this REVIEW), that the periodical is

unsatisfactory and suspicious. He finds the "cauda serpentina" in this quotation from the *Journal*:

"In considering the purchase of books, school equipment, and supplies generally, don't forget the advertisers in the *Journal*. They are all reliable and leaders in their respective lines. Moreover, they are aiding greatly to give the Catholic teachers of the country a first-class professional magazine of their own at small cost."



We are indebted to the Rev. Father Thomas Scully for a copy of a lecture, delivered by Francis J. Barnes, M. D., last April, under the auspices of the Alumni Association of Boston College, on "Catholic Education: Its Importance at the Present Day." It is a sound and solid exposition of some important and timely truths and deserves the widest possible circulation. Father Scully informs us that it can be had from Thos. J. Flynn & Co., of Boston, at five cents per copy retail, and \$30 per thousand wholesale. We intend to give extracts as soon as space permits.



Rev. A. L. A. Klauder, of Clintonville, N. Y., writes to inform THE REVIEW, in regard to Rev. Meifuss' remark in No. 16, that the ideas of Dr. E. C. Runge for a modern insane asylum will hardly be realized in the twenty-first century, much less in the twentieth,—that the ideas of Dr. Runge have long since been carried out in the East, in the St. Lawrence State Hospital, which has all the suggested features, except the gymnasium and the ten-pin alley. After all the other improvements realized in that vast institution, as advocated by Dr. Runge, Father Klauder, who was chaplain of the institution for several years, thinks these two small items will, no doubt, also be provided.



"Liberalism invariably and inevitably defeats itself. Every departure from the divine order is necessarily evil, as universal experience proves."—H. F. Brownson.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY



3 8151 001 32408 3

LIBRARY

**ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY**  
BRIGHTON, MASS.

